

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 1, 4-9 and 11-15, 17-20, 22-23 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of Venkatesan in further view of Thawte's "Web Server Certificates: 3.x Root Rollover".

The 'response to arguments' section states that the Venkatesan reference to the manufacturer therein corresponds to the "processing entity" which is a "broad term." Applicants have amended the claims to note inherent language indicating that the processing entities described in the claims refer to digital processing entities. Since the Office Action has cited Venkatesan's "vendor" as being the third digital processing entity, Applicants respectfully submit that the vendor alone is not a processing device or digital processing entity. As such it cannot teach providing the update complete data which is different from the updated data, under control of the third digital processing entity, for the second processing entity, because Venkatesan only appears to teach two processing entities. As such the claim is in condition for allowance. In addition, Claim 1 requires that the automatic redirecting of the communication from the first digital processing entity includes sending by the second processing entity, a uniform resource locator of the third processing entity, to the first processing entity in response to the second processing entity detecting the need to update data for the first processing entity. As such it is the second processing entity that detects the need to update data for the first processing entity. It is alleged however that applicants' claim was too broad with reference to redirection and also that Cheng taught the subject matter of the second processing unit detecting the need to update data for the first processing entity. However, Cheng uses the client computer itself (ie the first entity - page 10, lines 3-4) to detect whether applicable software updates occur,

the second digital processing entity (e.g. the database of software updates), does not detect the need to update data for the first processing entity. As such, Cheng does not teach what is alleged and therefore the claims are in condition for allowance.

As to Claim 28 and 23, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above and as such these claims are also in condition for allowance. Moreover, the claims require determining whether a certificate update should occur for the web browser based on whether cookies have been received by the web browser from the web server and processing entity or software update controller. Venkatesan does not provide the cookies as claimed nor contemplate such operation and as such Applicants again respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The cookie taught by Venkatesan is merely a representation of the installation number that is communicated to the client's computer. The cookie is not used by a second digital processing entity as claimed to determine whether to update data. Accordingly, that claim is in condition for allowance.


Additionally, claim 7 requires in part that the method of claim 1 includes determining whether a certificate update should occur for the first processing entity based on whether cookies have been received by the first processing entity from the second and third processing entities. The Office Action has cited Cheng, page 3, lines 14-48; Cheng, page 17, lines 20-30 and 49-55; Venkatesan, col. 14, lines 54-56; and Venkatesan, col. 15, lines 7-15 as teaching this limitation. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of these references appear silent as to the above claim limitation. Instead, these cited portions teach: a summary of how software updating occurs in Cheng's system, but with no mention of cookies to determine if updating should occur (Cheng, page 3, lines 14-48); the registration of new users to a service provider computer and the use of a data store describing the present operation of a client application, but

which is not used to determine if updating should occur (Cheng, page 17, lines 20-30 and 49-55); a cookie that merely represents the installation number that is communicated to a client computer, and is not used in the process of determining if any update should occur (Venkatesan, col. 14, lines 54-56); and a discussion of different kinds of information for which authentic signatures may be generated (Venkatesan, col. 15, lines 7-15). Accordingly, and as depending from allowable base claim 1, claim 7 is in condition for allowance. The other dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11-5-07

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone: (312) 609-7599
Fax: (312) 609-5005
Email: creckamp@vedderprice.com